

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 12-28, 32-41 are pending. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 21, 36 and 40 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 3-10, 15-21, 23-30 and 34-41 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bruschi (US 2004/0172293). The Examiner stated essentially that Bruschi teaches all of the limitations of Claims 1, 3-10, 15-21, 23-30 and 34-41.

Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include the limitations of allowable claims 11 and 31, respectively. Therefore, Claims 1 and 21 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 36 has been amended to include limitations similar to claim 11; therefore Claim 36 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Referring to Claim 40; Claim 40 recites, *inter alia*, a first data processing system comprising: a first repository that stores data records of an individual which include individual identifying information; a second data processing system comprising: a second repository that stores de-identified data records generated by the first data processing system; and a third data processing system comprising: a third repository that stores a master decryption key and an encryption system that can use the master decryption key to decrypt an encrypted ID of de-identified data records in the second repository to re-identify the individual.

Bruschi teaches a client history database 855 including an encrypted patient ID, contact information, and cleartext critical history data (see FIG. 8). Bruschi does not teach first, second, and third repositories storing individual identifying information, de-identified data records, and a

decryption key, respectively. Bruschi's system includes a database for storing both encrypted and cleartext. Therefore, Bruschi does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 40.

Claims 3-8 and 15-20 depend from Claim 1. Claims 23-28 and 34-35 depend from Claim 21. Claims 37-39 depend from Claim 36. Claim 41 depends from Claim 40. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. Claims 9-10 and 29-30 have been canceled. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruschi in view of Nagel (US 7,181,017). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Bruschi and Nagel teach all the limitations of Claims 2 and 22.

Claims 2 and 22 depend from Claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 21. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-14 and 32-33 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruschi in view of Jordan (US 6,823,203). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Bruschi and Jordan teach all the limitations of Claims 12-14 and 32-33.

Claims 12-14 and 32-33 depend from Claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 21. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-8, 12-28, 32-41 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: August 1, 2008

Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202
Attorney for Applicants

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3130